THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What are you talking? I have not allowed you. I gave you first precedence to raise the point of order What objection you have on that? It is not correct. You please sit down.

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV:*

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Again you are raising something which is not going to be on the record.

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV:*

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have *not allowed it to go on record.*

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Madam, Deputy Chairman, I was interrupted by this domestic fracas just when I was attempting to put this It is domestic in the sense that both are from Maharashtra.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: This is a problem in the House.

SHRI M. M. JACOB: I will request the Hon Member to withdraw the words. It is between the Chair and the Member.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN. This is what is happening in the House.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I said domestic since both of you are from Maharashtra *(Interruptions)*. The other day we had this precise point under discussion when the hon. Prime Minister was to make a statement on Sri Lanka. It was put across to us by the Secretary-General very eloquently and very forcefully that we should not ask clarifications because on a subsequent day a discussion is to take place on Sri Lanka. The precedent in Rajya Sabha is that we will ask clarifications, if the Treasury Benches choose to make a statement. I, therefore, appeal to you as the repository of our privileges, to permit us to ask clarifications or to ask the Treasury Benches to make the statement tomorrow.

SHRI M. M. JACOB: Just one point. Normally it is also the right of the Rajya Sabha to hear a statement that is made in the Lok Sabha, on the same day, that is why it is being made in the Rajya Sabha today. So, Members have a right to hear a statement that is made in the Lok Sabha

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: It reflects on the total working of this Government. If you were to come forward with an important statement ...

3.00 P.M.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let there not be any counter arguments, please. Let there be no counter arguments.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: But we do not forego our right to ask questions I am submitting my name officially

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE (West Bengal) May I make a suggestion? Let the Minister lay the statement on the Table of the House, instead of reading it.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think we can accept this suggestion. Let him lay the statement on the Table of the House.

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA: I lay on the Table of the House a statement on the current drought and flood situation and the steps taken by the Government for rendering relief to the affected population.

SHORT DURATION DISCUSSION ON THE SITUATION IN SRI LANKA

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Next item is Short Duration Discussion.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* SHRI V. ARUNACHALAM (Tamil Nadu): Madam, we are going to discuss an

*Not recorded.

important subject. It is unfortunate that the Minister concerned is not available when we are going to discuss it at a crucial time.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Minister right now is replying in the Lok Sabha. As soon as he is free, he will come.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): I am again on a point of order

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: How many times? Anyway, be brief.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I will be brief. One of the reasons why this debate was listed for today in the Rajya Sabha was the insistence by the Treasury Benches, acceded to by all of us on the Opposition, and the Chair, that, as put forward by the Treasury Benches, there is only one Minister to reply as far as Sri Lanka is concerned. I have the highest esteem for my friend Mr. Faleiro. But when the Treasury Benches had said that there is only one Minister to reply to this debate, surely the normal courtesy on the part of the Treasury Benches should have been to ensure that one Minister is present here. And there is a full-fledged Minister of External Affairs, let us not forget that.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It was also told at that time that Mr Faleiro will be present here and listen to the discussion, and I am just now told that the Minister right now is in the Lok Sabha replying to some points raised there, and as soon as it is over, he will come here

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO): And I may assure you that all your points will be noted.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE (West Bengal) We have the highest regard for you. Now, Madam, you were present in that meeting also. Initially, the understanding was that we may take it up simultaneously in both the Houses. At that stage it was suggested that hon. Minister, Mr. Eduardo Faleiro, will be present there and the other Minister will not be there. In fact, there is till another full-fledged Minister. He could be present here and give us the reply. However the subsequent course of discussion was that instead of taking it up simultaneously in both the Houses, to facilitate the presence of senior Minister, it should be taken up on a different date, and that was the consensus in the House. We all agreed that it should be on Wednesday here and the Senior Ministers will be present here

This is just to remind you, Madam, so that you can instruct the Government accordingly.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE (Mharashtra): Madam, Deputy Chairman, the Opposition is adept at making much ado about nothing We face this difficlty and when I say 'we' I include every member as distinct from the treasury benches We face this difficulty but Business has to be adjusted when a common topic, when the same issue, is discussed in both the Houses. We know that the same issue was taken up for discussion in the other House yesterday I have with me over 150 pages of the record of yesterday's proceedings. For example, we started the discussion on *Sati* yesterday and we could not complete it yesterday itself It spilled over and we took a good part of today to conclude the discussion These things do happen They are not intended at all. I think, the Opposition is understanding enough Some sort of an adjustment is necessary when there is a situation like this There is no doubt that when the discussion gets under way, the Minister will be here. I also want Mr Natwar Singh to be here because he is the person who has been going and meeting Mr. Jayewardene. As has been assured, however, Mr Faleiro will be taking note of the points made here. This objection is entirely without substance I think we should, without any further delay, start the debate on this very important and sensitive subject.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY (Karnataka): That is not the point. The question is, it is a major debate. There is no disrespect shown to my friend, Mr. Eduardo Faleiro in this matter. What we are concerned with here is that this is a major debate and when such a major debate is on, the Minister who is handling the issue should be present. It is not that any Minister can be present here. Of course, Mr. Faleiro is here. He is also a Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs. But he is not handling the subject. (*Interruptions*). He may be competent, more competent too I agree. I concede. But he is not handling the subject at all. Therefore, this House should not be taken for granted. My friend just now said that there is no motive at all There may not be any motive.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: I said, these things do happen.

SHRI M.S. GURUPADASWAMY: I agree. But care has to be taken to see that this House is respected. This is a major debate and the hon Minister who is dealing with the subject should be present. (*Interruptions*).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let us hear what the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs has to say. (Interruptions)

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: We can adjourn the House for sometime.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI M. M. JACOB): Please give me a chance to speak. (*Interruptions*). I do not interrupt when hon. Members from the other side speak. I speak only occasionally, very seldom, when it is necessary

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: That is the wrong thing you do.

SHRI M M JACOB: Madam, as you yourself mentioned, the hon Minister, Mr. Faleiro is here. I would like to point out that the Minister is in the midst of his speech in the other House. He will come here as soon at it is over. (*Interruptions*). Mr. Jaswant Singh, please allow me. Earlier, when you were speaking, you told me not to interrupt you. I hope you will show me the same courtesy. As I said, I speak only occasionally, not often. As I said, Mr. Natwar Singh is replying in the Lok Sabha now and as soon as he finishes there he will be here. In the meantime, the debate on this important matter can be started because there are a large number of speaker who want to place their viewpoints before the House is waiting to hear the speches. I would request you to allow the debate to begin Mr Faleiro is here to take note of the points Mr Natwar Singh has not finished his speech in the other House.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA alias V. ARUNACHALAM: The point for consideration of the House is, what was the understanding in the Business Advisory Committee and whether we are carrying out the decision of the Business Advisory Committee or not. We do not know when the Minister will complete his reply in the other House. There is an uncertainty. When the discussion is about to begin, his presence is quite essential because he is the person who is dealing with the subject

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is no doubt that the Minister's presence is necessary and he is ready to be present here The only point is that right now he is replying in the Lok Sabha. The reply is not over. As soon as it is over, he would be coming over here in this House. Sometimes it does happen that the reply is not completed within the stipulated time. Just as it happened in the case of 'sati', we were discussing it and the discussion could not be completed yesterday. Sometimes it does happen that we are not able to complete the discussion That does not mean that the Minister is showing disrespect or disregard to the House I would like the hon. Members to consider this They are very senior, considerate and what not. So, I would like to request them to bear with this and not waste the important time of the House.

I have to make an announcement that the Prime Minister will make a statement on his visit abroad at 4.30 p.m. today.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY (Tamil Nadu): Madam Deputy Chairman, the hon. Prime Minister made the statement on the situation in Sri Lanka. So, had he been present now, it would have served the purpose of the discussion. The Prime Minister, I expected, would be present in the House, but I am disappointed that even the hon. Mr Natwar Singh, who has been handling this issue, also is not here when I ventilate my point of view on this issue.

[The Vice-Chairman (Shri H. Hanumanthappa) in the Chair]

Anyhow, it has become a total tragedy of the Sri Lankan Tamils *(Interruptions)*. That is the tragedy that the Minister, who is handling the affairs could not be present when I put my point of view. That is the tragedy I face here also.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN (Tamil Nadu): You can speak after he comes.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Thank you for the suggestion, Madam I know what is your point. We are discusing this issue under the shadow of a great tragedy of Tamils. It is the darkest hour in the history of Sri Lankan Tamils, a history of humiliation and persecution, a history of sorrow and suffering, a history of struggle and sacrifice, a history of agony and anguish, a history of facing sell-outs and betrayals But the Tamils all over the world today are terribly shocked to witness the most unkindest cuts and the most unkindest stabs from the most unexpected quarter, from the quarter nobody expected, from the quarter from whom the Tamils have been longing for succour and solace, from the quarter where the kith and kin of Tamils are living.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would like to come straight-away to certain questions raised in the statement made by the hon. Prime Minister. In his statement, the hon. Prime Minister said: "It is a matter of great regret that the LTTE threw away all this. They went back on every commitment they had given to us." This was stated in Vancouver also.

Repeatedly he has been making this charge against the LTTE May I ask this Government and through you, Sir, the hon. Prime Minister to substantiate this charge? What are the instances, one by one, when they went back? What were the commitments they made? You should substantiate because it is a serious charge. Because our Indian armed forces have waged a total war against them, therefore this charge should be substantiated by the Government. He speaks about the Accord. Our hon. Prime Minister again goes on to say that the LETTE deliberate set out to wreck the Agreement. Here come the basic question. He says, the LTTE have set out to wreck the Agreement. May I ask the basic, the fundamental question which I did put to Mr. Natwar Singh when he replied to the Short Duration Discussion during the last Session? I repeat the same categorical and specific question: whether the LTTE gave their consent for the Accord before our hon. Prime Minister did put his signature in Colombo? The hon. Minister then evaded that question Till date, the Government has not replied this specific question. But here is the statement of Mr. Prabhakaran of 4th August at Sudu before a mammoth public gathering where more than hundred journalists and pressmen from many parts of the world were present In that meeting, the Chief of the LTTE stated this—and I quote his speech:

> You are aware that this Agreement, concluded suddenly and with great speed between India and Sri Lanka, without consulting us and without consulting our people's representatives, is being implemented with expedition and urgency. Until I went to Delhi, I did not know anything about this Agreement. Saying that the Indian Prime Minister desired to see me, they invited me and took me quickly to Delhi. This Agreement was shown to us after I went there Accordingly

[Shri V. Gopalsamy]

made it emphatically clear to the Indian Government that we were unable to accept this Agreement. But the Indian Government stood unbudging on the point that whether we accepted or did not accept the Agreement, it was determined to put it into effect. We firmly objected to the conclusion of this Agreement without consultation with our people and without seeking our views. However, there is no point in our objecting to this. When a great power has decided to determine our political fate in a manner that is essentially beyond our control what are we to do?...This Agreement disarms us suddenly, without giving us time, without getting the consent of our fighters, without working out a guarantee for our people's safety and protection. Therefore we refused to surrender arms.

In taking from us our weapons—the one means of protection for Eelam Tamils—the Indian Government takes over from us the big responsibility of protecting our people. The handing over of arms only signifies the handing over, the transfer of this responsibility. I wish very firmly to emphasise here that by virtue of our handing over our weapons to it, the Indian Government should assume full responsibility for the life and security of every one of the Eelam Tamils. The time is not very far off when the monster of Sinhala racism will devour this Agreement.

Let me make it clear to you here, beyond the shadow of a doubt that I will continue to fight for the objective of attaining Tamil Eelam."

Sir, this was the statement made by Mr Prabhakaran on 4th August, which clearly establishes the fact that they did not agree, did not give their consent, to the agreement. But he says, "When a mighty power like India decides to go on, what could we do? We are helpless." This is the statement that was made. Mr. Puri went to Jaffna and informed Mr. Prabhakaran that the Indian Prime Minister wanted to see him, that he could come to Delhi and have discussions with him. When he was brought here, a copy of the agreement was shown to him. This is his statement When I went to meet him in the Ashok Hotel, I could not. Nobody could enter, nobody could meet him, no pressman was allowed and he was kept incommunicado. The next day, anyhow, he made it an issue with the Intelligence people and then, with great difficulty, he contacted me over the telephone. At that time he told me. "We have been betrayed, we have been stabbed behind our back That was the immediate reaction I gave to the press, that appeared in the press, that we have been tricked, trapped and stabbed behind our back and we have no other go. We have to face the Indian Army also"

That was the first, immediate, reaction of the LTTE. Then, of course, he was taken to our honourable Prime Minister and a discussion took place Mr Prabhakaran told me, "Had I hurt the Indian Government or the Prime Minister or India because I stated 'We have no other go, we have to face the Indian Army with our Arms? That is why I diluted my statement. I said, yes; of course, the Prime Minister is sympathetic towards our problem. "But I did not give my censent for the accord."

Therefore, this is the history of the accord. They were not a party to the accord. The accord was not between the warring parties; the accord was not between the oppressor and the opressed. The accord was between the mediator and the aggressor. Therefore, when say they want to wreck the accord, you should substantiate your charge and say in what way they sabotaged the accord. But the case is different. It was Mr. Jayewardene who signed the accord in Colombo. He gave the first mortal blow to the agreement—not accord—because, immedaitely after signing the agreement, when the minds of the whole Tamilian popualtion were agitated over the issue of merger of the two units, that is, the north and the east, he said publicly, "I myself will go and campaign against the merger of these two units." So, it is he who tried to sabotage the agreement, not the LTTE. I would

like to know from the honourable Minister whether the Government of India did protest against the statement made by Mr. Jayewardene.

Again all these years they have been fighting on the question of State-aided colonization But, immediately after the agreement was signed, State-aided colonization was speeded up in the eastern province with the total package of the Government. It was pointed out by moderates, even by the TULF. In some parts of the north also the colonization went on. Where is the accord here? When Mr. Jayewardene himself seys, "I will myself campaign against the merger", when the Sri Lankan Government itself engineers colonization of the eastern parts—the traditional homeland of the Tamils—where is the accord? The accord was torn to pieces by the Sri Lankan Government itself. Sir, our Prime Minister repeatedly says and even two days back he has made the statement that all the Tamil demands have been met and that they have got more than what they wanted. He has said this in Vancouver also.

What are the demands? The basic demand for Eelam, you don't agree. All right, you don't accept the demand for Eelam.

Where do they stand, including the TULF? Even during the Thimpu talks they were very emphatic on one question, about the question of land. They said that the traditional homeland should be one unit, it should be treated as one unit. That is, the North-East. That is the basic demand. The President of Sri Lanka has totally objected, and he stated that there is no question of traditional homeland. This is two days after the signing the agreement, he says that there is no question of traditional homeland What has been the demand o the Tamils all these years.

Then, they demanded that the right of self-determination should be recognised. This demand was not accepted. But Sir, our PM says, their demands have been accepted. Even the TULF, the moderates and others have pointed out that these Bills which have been introduced did not meet the aspirations of the Tamils and that the devolution of powers which was assured would never satisfy the Tamils, any of the groups.

Then, one more point on the question of colonization. The Propaganda Secretary of the Political Wing, Mr Dileepan, started fast unto death. Mr. Chairman, 200 army camps were not dismantled as per the agreement. Police stations were opened in the Tamil areas. So, the situation became very tense. Mr. Dileepan started his fast unto death. After 12 days he died at a tender age. Of course, many may not share the grief of those people who cry. But, Sir, our All India Radio did ridicule the fast unto death. This was the attitude of the Indan Government. I would like to ask a simple question. The statement says, Mr. Dixit rushed many times. Did he go to the place where he was fasting? Did he persuade him? Did he make a request? If the demands had been conceded or had some effective steps been taken to stop the colonisaiton, his precious life would have been saved. All right. He passed away.

Sir, why did the war break out? Because the hon. Prime Minister blamed the LTTE that started the attack on the IPKF, and the reason given by the Government is that they went back on every commitment. Here comes the question of the Interim Administrative Council, the formation of the Interim Administrative Council. The Government makes it a big issue, that they accepted They gave three names in the list. All right. And they preferred one name. But Mr Jayewardene chose another name This has created the problem. I would like to request my hon. colleagues to consider this aspect. Of course, they might have committed a mistake, I agree with you. At the first instance, they did not give the name of Mr. Padmanathan. After he was released from Jail, his name was given. They insisted on Mr. Dixit that Mr. Padmanabhan should be selected because he represents the East. But he was not selected. Jayewardene chose Sivagnanam. Then, they expressed their reservation. But why they rejected it totally, that should

[Shri V. Gopalsamy]

be noticed because the other two names among the first six were from Batticaloa. They were also dropped in the council. That is the main reasons. So they suspected the conspiracy of Jayewardene that the East will go against the North. People may that it is a pro-North council. The two names Kasianandan and Ramesh were dropped because they represented Batticaloa. They have said that "because these two names have been dropped now you kindly consider that Padmanabhan should be made; otherwise in the East there will be an ill-feeling" This is what they were telling and that problem was not solved Of course, I accept even if it is taken as a mistake, even if you think that the LTTE has committed a mistake, could it justify a war? No. That was not the problem. That was not the main reason for this present conflict.

After this event another most unfortunate tragic incident took place That was the turning point What was that? Sir, 17 LTTE men were arrested by the Sri Lankan Navy off Point Pedro Out of these 17 LTTE men, two top-level Commanders were there, namely, Pulendran and Kumarappa. Not only that others were also very important, of the top rung leadership Our Prime Minister has said in his statement that they were arrested in the boat when they were having mounted machine guns. All right, I accept it. They did not care about death Most of our friends also say that they have become fanatics and they simply welcome death All right when they were arrested by the Sri Lankan Navy, why did they not fight? Instead of taking cyanide they would have died fighting. They thought already amnesty has been declared by Mr Jayewardene and by mistake the Sri Lankan Navy is arresting already the IPKF is here on whom the responsibility of protecting them is entrusted and the IPKF will rescue them With that hope, with that confidence, they did not fire, they did not fight. (*Time bell rings*) I started only 15 minutes back.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Just plan to conclude.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY. I was given to understand that more time will be given to me Most of our colleagues also said this thing. Otherwise, I would not have elaborated all these things.

So, what happened? When they were taken to Palali camp they expected that IPKF would rescue them from the Sri Lankan forces. It happened on the 3rd October Immediately Prabhakaran informed our High Commission that they should not be allowed to be taken to Colombo because the moment they are arrested, they are taken into custody by the Sri Lankan forces, they have taken a vow to finish themselves by taking cyanide capsules, but not because of fear that they will be tortured by the Sri Lankan forces. Even getting tortured by them will be a shame That was their concept. He informed the High Commission, "don't allow them to be taken to Colombo" and when they were about to be taken to the Sri Lankan Air Force plane to Colombo they took cyanide capsules and Kumarappa snatched five capsules of the five cadres and swallowed the time capsules and 12 of them died immediately. Our hon, Prime Minister on the other day says if there is a torture we could understand. There were 12 bayonet arks on the body of Pulendran and they died. That was the turning point. That triggered the whole situation. That was a reason for the eruption, spontaneous outburst, spontaneous reaction and this was done at the instance of Mr. Lalit Athulathmudali. He intervened that they should be brought here, no amnesty and they were brought there and Lalit Athulathmudali intervened in this and these people were about to be taken when they finished themselves.

Sir, I was shocked to hear the version of the hon Prime Minister that you could link the suicide with the

repercussions. It might be deliberate. I never expected such words from our hon. Prime Minister. I never expected to hear discourteous words against those people who died. Sir, I remember, when Smt. Indira Gandhi was assassinated, there were riots. People were killed I could understand that was the reaction of the public and I remember the words of the hon. Prime Minister, he stated, when a big tree falls, the earth is bound to shake Of course, these commanders were lauded by the people Mr. Pulendran and Kumarappa, on many occasions had protected the Tamilians of Eastern province from the attack of the Sinhalese army. They had defeated the Sinhalese army in many battles. They were the heroes of the masses. When they had the news that they died, there was a spontaneous reaction and the killings were there. In the statement, the Prime Minister stated, killings of the civilians. He did not mention the Sinhalese civilians. I do not justify the killings, but how it happened? Even two days back, killings were there 200 people were killed. It is because of the JVP action I am told. What you have done? There were killings. Your guns did not turn that side Could it be a justification for an all-out war against the LTTE? What our supreme commander, Mr. Dipinder Singh, who is the overall commander of the IPKF had said appeared in the Hindu dated 26th October 1987 and I quote: "By October 6th, the IPKF had started raids to recover the weapons belonging to the militants and the LTTE. The LTTE camps were raided and on October 8th orders were issued to close the T.V. and Radio Station of the LTTE in Jaffna and on October 9th, action was taken." Sir, on 8th and 9th action was taken by the IPKF against the LTTE. The LTTE camps were raided and their two newspaper offices were burnt They were totally destroyed, blasted with the explosives and the T.V. and the Radio Stations were blasted All this took place before 10th and then in self-defence, they retaliated the attack. The LTTE the attack. I would request my hon. colleagues to lend their ears to the anguished cry of the slaughtered race. How many civilians have died. According to Hindu dated October 24th, from the eyewitness account Jai Raj, he was there, and I quote: "During ten days of fighting during which period, I was in Jaffna, the civilian casualties figures collected by me independently were, 192 killed and 485 people injured. I was able to interview several residents and also visited the area. All of them were grown-ups and children and they alleged that Indian troops had killed the civilians. With this incident, the popular Tamil perception became hostile in my observation." Then Mr. Vasika Rao also said something about it It appeared in the *'Indian Express* of October 27th It is also an eye-witness account. He said and I quote: "An old man came out from the ward from Jaffna hospital holding his grand-son and alleged that his daughter several other members of the famil were killed in Indian shelling. The State creates a distinct impression that IPKF persons are resented. The senior army officials said that when the hostilities between IPKF and the LTTE began on October 9th, more than 90 per cent of the Jaffna population backed the militants and provided logistic support. This support is still evident, the officials said and from the Catholic Clergy, a message has been given, that the last one week has seen the worst kind of sufferings of our people. The indiscriminate shelling of the entire area has caused the death of more than a hundered civilians in their own homes and rendered an unprecedented number injured". And Shyam Tekwani, who was there in the thick of the fight has given his account and it has appeared in 'India Today'. It reads thus:

[Shri V. Gopalsamy]

"Some western journalists, who entered Jaffna after the battle started, have returned with horror stories of IPKF troops going berserk after their comrades were killed and accused them of shooting innocent people and of raping Tamil women. The Tigers refer to the IPKF as the Innocent People Killing Force."

Sir, the following is the account of Phil Jones a BBC Correspondent who was taken to the Jaffna Peninsula and Jaffna City by the LTTE on October 20 and this was broadcast over the BBC world service on October 20 and 21:

"The Tigers took myself and two other journalists through an arduous 13-hour journey through dust routes and jungle tracks to the centre of the Jaffna City. This tour made me see the sight of smashed buildings and converse with scores of angry Tamil refugees."

The account continues thus:

"Over 300,000 Tamil refugees took shelter in previously designated places like temples, schools and public buildings. But there are numerous and furious complaints by them about the Indian army; the army had shelled the very places where people had earlier been asked to take shelter. The people said the Indian army had shot dead several innocent Tamil civilians who were hiding in their houses and had killed over 300 persons with their ill-aimed artillery."

On 20th October, on the floor of the Australian Parliament, a member Mr. Kent spoke on the Sri Lanka situation and he made the following observations:

"It seemed to me, after reading the agreement, that it will not resolve the ethnic problems, and it will do nothing else but to postpone the day of reckoning.

"Recent Press reports indicate that the Indian troops are involved in an all-out battle against Tamil guerillas, completely disregarding the safety of the civilian population."

Sir, they say to disarm the LTTE the IPKF has been launched

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI H HANUMANTHAPPA) Please conclude now.

SHRI V GOPALSAMY: It was not to me some more time. On many occasions Members have taken 40 to 45 minutes.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI H HANUMANTHAPPA). All right, do.

SHRI V GOPALSAMY: It was not to disarm them. Why do they take more than 100 tanks, helicopters, war ships and 30,000 soldiers? Not to disarm them but to destroy them. That is why I said about the casualties. That is civilian casualties I showed some of my colleagues a cassette, video cassette This is it I can show it in the Central Hall.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): You are not permitted to show it here (*Interruptions*)

SHRI V GOPALSAMY: I am just saying I am possessing the evidence. The Australian telecast is also cassetted. Civilians have been killed. But the Government of India and even the hon. Prime Minister are spreading a false and malicious propaganda that LTTE is attacking the Muslims This was the conspiracy by Jayewardene. He was trying to engineer clashes between LTTE and Muslims but he failed. But our Government, our Prime Minister, made an observation about the LTTE attacking Muslims. This is false. It was said that the prisoners were burnt alive by the LTTE but subsequently the IPKF commanders themselves denied any such incident. Mr. Sumir Pal talked to the prisoners and it has appeared in 'Telegraph" that the prisoners stated that they have been treated well by the LTTE and he also said that they conversed with him in Hindi which could not be understood by the LTTE The Tigers shared the same food with the prisoners which they had. So they have not been treated badly. But our Government has decided to spread Goebbelsian propaganda through its powerful media, TV and AIR, that they are committing atrocities. It is an

atrocious propaganda against LTTE. I would like to ask one question: Why is not the Government prepared for a ceasefire? The Prime Minister said no authoritative response has come from LTTE. But today's *Hindu* says this and I quote its editorial. Today *The Hindu* is supporting the Government stand:

> "What is more worrying, the Government of India has failed in inform Parliament that there has been an authoritative response from the LTTE leader, Mr V. Prabhakaran (dated November 6) conveyed through the Tamil Nadu Chief Minister, which asks for a 48-hour ceasefire so that the leadership of the militant organisation could meet and take a political decision that could be positive from an Indian standpoint."

> "Is breaking the LTTE as an organisation part of India's larger objective?"

This is the question posed in the editorial. I would like to ask the Government whether any such response, authoritative response, from the LTTE was conveyed to this Government, as per the editorial of *The Hindu* today? If so, why have you not informed Parliament on that day? When the Prime Minister made the statement, why did he fail to inform Parliament if such a message was conveyed to him? He could have said he could not accept the message. Therefore, it is very crystal clear. When Mr K. C. Pant was there, when he shared the same platform with Mr. JRJ, he offered one million rupees for the head of Prabhakaran. Is it not a shame for the Indian Defence Minister to share the same platform without rebutting the murderous offer that there should be one million rupees for the head of Prabhakaran? Why did not take an audacious stand, an arrogant stand, saying 'Let them go to the IPKF commanders'? It is not expected of a democratic Government. You have a might, force. You have the largest, biggest, powerful, army. Of course, I share the grief of the bereaved families of the jawans who have died; I share their grief. But at the same time I am very pained to say that our honourable Prime Minister, when he expressed his condolences, he did not utter a word of condolence to the members of the bereaved families of the civilian Tamils who have died there — leave alone those of the LTTE. Do they, those civilian Tamils, not deserve the sympathy, the condolence, of our honourable Prime Minister? That was the attitude you have taken. You are very rigid now. Do you want to protect them or do you want to finish them? You want to destroy them. That is why you have taken this stand. Mr. Premadasa on the floor of the General Assembly of the United Nations made intolerable insinuations against this Government, against India, against our Government. The same was done by Mr. JRJ here at the Delhi Airport and our honourable Prime Minister was meekly standing behind. It is an insult to the pride of India, the pride of 80 crores of Indians, the mighty India. India was insulted and humiliated by JRJ and Premadasa and you have not uttered a word against those utterances. And now you say, let them go to the IPKF commanders. You want to destroy them. That is the sole aim of JRJ. You are playing a mercenary's role now. You want to finish them. But I warn this Government, the moment the nucleus of the Tamil militancy is destroyed in the Jaffna peninsula, the moment the Tamil militancy is destroyed in Sri Lanka, the next day, whether JRJ is in the chair or somebody else, they could say, "your dirty job is over, you get out". He can say that. When my friend, Mr. Maran, said Madam Gandhi described the events as genocide, the same genocide is being committed by IPKF, our Prime Minister said he was ashamed of it. But it has appeared in the press. (*Interruptions*).

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH): I take a very strong objection to say that the IPKF was committing genocide. He must withdraw that word.

SHRI V GOPALSAMY: I am substantiating my charge. It has appeared in the *Telegraph*. It has appeared in the "Telegraph" dated the 31st October that the independent "Sun" carried a box

[Shri V. Gopalsamy]

item that India is now using the same means that the Government in New Delhi and the Indian Press had unsparingly condemned the Sri Lankan army for. They say that what you condemned the Sri Lankan army for is being done by the Indian army.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): You have to conclude now.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY. If we try to expose the crimes and atrocities committed against our kith and kin by the IPKF, you can call it even treason. If it is guilty to expose the heinous crimes committed by the Government, if it is guilty to expose the crimes committed by the IPKF, if it is guilty to plead for justice for our people, I am ready to be called guilty! And, Sir, our honourable Prime Minister said, "Consequences will follow", when Mr. Maran uttered this word. Yes, we have faced the consequences during the Emergency. He lost his health during his detention. What consequences can follow? What consequences? There can be only one ultimate consequence and that is the consequence of the gallows and I am prepared even to face the gallows ..(*Interruptions*)

SHRI T. R BALU (Tamil Nadu). We are prepared for it (*Interruptions*) .

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Then what consequences? You have committed atrocities against our people and you have killed our people. (*Interruptions*)..They could not get even medical care and treatment. Our wailing mothers and our weeping sisters could not get treatment. (*Interruptions*) They could not get any medical treatment because even the hospitals have been totally destroyed and you want to wipe them out Young girls have been taken away and kept as ransom. Wherever they see boys of fifteen years or so, they shoot them down and you say, "Let them go to the IPKF commander". . ..(*Interruptions*) .I would request this Government through you, Sir..(*Interruptions*).

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Please conclude now.

SHRI V GOPALSAMY: to order a cease-fire (*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Please conclude now. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: I am concluding (*Interruptions*). I am concluding (*Interruptions*) I request this Government .

SHRI ANAND SHARMA (Himachal Pradesh): I am on a point of order, Sir. We are having a debate on an important subject But, unfortunately..

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Madhya Pradesh): What is the point of order? (*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H HANUMANTHAPPA): Let us know what the point of order is .(*Interruptions*).

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: I am coming to that (*Interruptions*) . Sir, the honour of the nation and the morale of the Indian army and its image are more important than anything else to this country and the people (*Interruptions*)

SHRI T R. BALU. What morale? . (*Interruptions*). What morale? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Sir, can this be the forum for us to malign and accuse the Indian army of what it has not done?. (*Interruptions*). Can this House be the forum for it? (*Interruptions*).

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE This is no point of order. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA (Aandhra Pradesh) You have expressed an opinon (*Interruptions*) You have expressed your opinion. But what is the point of order in it? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Sir, I do not agree with my friend. But this is not a point of order.. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI T. R. BALU: This is all reported in the papers ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: In which newspapers have they been reported? (*Interruptions*) . Sir, you have to define the parameters of this discussion .. (*Interruptions*) . .. I would like to know if the parameters have been defined for this discussion. I will not remain silent (*Interruptions*).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA) You come to your point of order.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: The morale of the Indian army was destroyed when you gave them the unpopular task. What more do you want? .... (*Interruptions*) ....

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Sir, the accusations against the IPKF must be withdrawn . (*Interruptions*)

SHRI T. R. BALU: What they have done is all against the innocent people.... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Mr. Sharma, I share your concern .. (*Interruptions*) . I share your concern.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी अगर शर्मा जी बोलना चाहते हैं तो जरूर बोलें लेकिन इस तरह से बीच में टोका-टाकी नहीं करनी चाहिये ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA) : All of you, please sit down.

SHRI SUKHDEV PRASAD: (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, he has taken complete one hour... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI T. R. BALU: But that one hour has not been wasted.. . (*Interruptions*)

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: I want to know whether this expression will go on record or it will be expunged.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN. Let him substantiate it or let that be expunged.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: (Pondicherry): My friend is giving distorted facts. He is accusing the IPKF. ..

SHRI T. R. BALU: It is for the Minister to reply. (*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H HANUMANTHAPPA): I appeal to the senior Member.. (*Interruptions*) You don't allow him to complete what is his point of order?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Was this a point of order?

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA) With due respect to you, Mr. Vajpayee.... (*Interruptions*)

श्री आनन्द शर्मा : अगर आप समझ न पाए, अगर देश का अपमान हो रहा है . (व्यवधान)

I seek your protection, Sir, I have said something which is very relevant.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): I know that.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: I want your ruling. (*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA). When a Member rises for a point of order, it is between the Chair and the Member. The Chair is independent to take a decision whether there is a point of order or not. I request senior Members to abide by this.

SHRI ATAL BEHARI VAJPAYEE: Now you give your ruling.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): There is no point of order in that. You should have waited till then. I only request senior Members and leaders to abide by this. That is No. 1 And. I will look into the proceedings. Whatever is unparliamentary, I am going to expunge it from the records. You can rest assured that the proceedings will be looked into.

SHRI ATAL BEHARI VAJPAYEE: For what?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Have patience. Why don't you have patience?

SHRI ATAL BEHARI VAJPAYEE: There is nothing unparliamentary.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): There is a demand from a section of the House for that. As I have said, the proceedings will be looked into. If there is anything unparliamentary....

SHRI ATAL BEHARI VAJPAYEE: Nobody has said that he has used any unparliamentary expression. He has said that they should substantiate the charge.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): The Minister will take care of that. He will answer if there are distorted facts. There are speakers from the ruling side. The Minister who is handling this will take care of these things. Let the discussion be in order

SHRI K NATWAR SINGH. The hon. Member has said that the IPKF was committing genocide. He should withdraw these remarks.

SHRI V GOPALSAMY: I stand by it. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI T. R. BALU: Yes.. (*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Mr. Balu, you are not allowing your own Member to proceed Mr. Gopalsamy, you should conclude within one minutes.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR SAHU (Orissa): I want tc make one submission. This is a very sensitive issue that we are discussing, and many times heat and emotions play a role. I appeal to both sides to exercise restraint. I never disturb anybody. Sir, the IPKF do not have the opportunity to defend themselves for what they are doing. You can blame the politicians, but. . (*Interruptions*)

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY. You can't criticize the police then. (*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Don't test the tolerence of the Chair, Mr. Gopalsamy.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR SAHU: It is only a submission. There is no ruling involved in that. I only appeal, Sir, that there should not be such remarks which create some confusion and have a demoralising effect on the Army.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: I appeal to this Government. .

SHRI ATAL BEHARI VAJPAYEE: May I make another submission?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): I am sorry.

SHRI ATAL BEHARI VAJPAYEE: You allow the Congress Members to make submissions. (*Interruptions*) My submission is that Mr. Gopalsamy should be allowed to conclude his speech uninterrupted.

4.00 P.M.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Mr Vice-Chairman, Sir, I appeal to this Government, through you, to order ceasefire and go back to the position of October 9.

Sir, If you want to protect the unity and integrity of Sri Lanka at the cost of the lives of Tamils, then the unity and integrity of this country will be in jeopardy. You are sowing the seeds of distintegration in the minds of Tamils. I warn you. And you are responsible for every drop of blood the Indian soldiers shed The Prime Minister is responsible for the casualties as well as the killing. And this is the statement prepared by Mr. Jayewardene and read out shamelessly by the Prime Minister of India in this country.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, barring Punjab, there has hardly been any other subject which has been discussed in this House over the last five years with so much of anguish, with so much of concern as the situation in Sri Lanka from time to time. And in this House as well as in the international forum I have had that privilege of saying some of the harsthest things against the Jayewardene Government. Repeatedly I have produced in this House the Amnesty Reports which showed what serious infraction of human rights was committed by Jayewardene and the Sinhalese soldiers against the Sri Lankan Tamils. And what I have stated is a matter of record. And, therefore, I appeal today that when I say this I want to put the record straight At that time what was put against us was —and very often I had to differ from our own Government—that how can India interfere with the internal and domestic problems of Sri Lanka. What was quoted, what was said by the Janata Prime Minister in 1978 was that 'this is an internal problem of Sri Lanka'. But I said, no, on two grounds we can interfere. One ground was that there is a violation, a gross violation, a persistent violation of human rights in Sri Lanka and India cannot be a silent spectator to the perpetuation of this violation of human rights. The second aspect I said was that we have on our soil, on the Indian soil refugees of over a lakh and twenty-five thousand. And there is an international law, the principal of *non-refoulement* whereby it becomes the bounden duty of the country to which the refugees come, it becomes the bouden duty of India to see that these refugees go back to their homelands fully protected in their life, in their property and in their honour. It was I who was constantly suggesting that the time had come for India to interfere. And I was getting almost impatient and including my friends like Chandrahasan had the occasion to acknowledge with some gratitude what I said repeatedly in this House. Therefore, I share the anguish of my hon. friend, Mr. Gopalsamy. But one must look at the reason. What was the position then? The position just before the Accord was that the Tamils were being battered by the Sri Lankan Army. We spoke of the presence of several foreign agencies at that time. We spoke of the mercenary Mossad of Israel. We spoke of the Pakistani giving military training. We spoke of so many other agencies, including the South African men's presence to take revenge against the Sri Lankan Tigers. And what did we do? This first thing we did when Jaffna was seized, when it was battered, when the hospital was about to be bombarded, was that we sent our ships with all the assistance, medicines, food and other relief and succour. And when that was stopped, we airdropped, a thing which was objected to by Pakistan even. But we air dropped the supplies to civilians and it was at that time, when everybody was clamouring in this House, that it was appreciated that this ethnic conflict between Sri Lankan Tamils and Sinhalese could not be solved without the intervention of India. Ultimately, both countries have been neighbours for centuries Both have a common and a rich cultural heritage This is fortunately one country which is not submerged in dictatorship like all our other neighbours. This is one country where democracy survives in this region. So we had many things in common and we were

[Shri Murlidhar Chandrakant Bhandare]

a giant and it was a tiny country. And, it was therefore expected and nobody, had even a doubt that it is only India's intervention which can bring about a legitimate solution, and, therefore, the demand which was made by the whole House, as one here, not once but repeatedly But now everybody is blaming us for the accord. I cannot really understand a greater duplicity than this. (*Interruptions*). It was at this stage, kindly look at it, don't forget the 17th and 18th June, that Lalit Athulathmudali, the Security Minister of Jayewardene, he made a panic airdash to Karachi and Pakistan showed its willingness to sign a friendship treaty with Sri Lanka I shudder what would have happened if that treaty had gone through. I am coming to security aspect a little later. I am not going to take too much time of the House, because other Members will also dwell on it.

It was for the sake of saving the Sri Lankan Tamils from the Sinhalese army that this accord was reached It is a matter of greatest irony, it is a matter of greatest tragedy that we went there to save but what we go in return. I will come to that a little later. I want to place before you both sides. Let us understand the accord had to be within certain parameters We are a freedom loving nation India is the leader of freedom loving nations. If one country consistently all over the world has fought against imperialism, against colonialism, it is India. And, therefore, we could not do any thing which would jeopardize the independence, integrity or the sovereignity of Sri Lanka A solution had to be found. A solution had to be found within the unity and integrity of Sri Lanka Therefore, as rightly said by the hon. Prime Minister the other day, it was impossible to concede Eelam, because if we conceded a partition of Sri Lanka, we could not psssibly talk of something else in our own country We have spoken always with one voice and taken a firm and a pricipled stand in this matter and I think we have protected the interests of the Tamils. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Why did you support Bangladesh? You cannot dictate terms to them and what policy they should have Eelam or not. That is not your business.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: I am quite sure whatever may have been done or said by my friend, I won't be a party to saying that Sri Lanka should be partitioned. I am very clear on that As an Indian I am saying that.

SHRI V GOPALSAMY: I say they should have Eelam I say again that they should have Eelam. It is not your business. What right have you got . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): You have had your say for one hour.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: What right have you got to dictate terms?

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: What was secured under the accord? Joining of the eastern and the northern provinces had in effect meant that an ealam was created Administration was created; an Administrative Council was created; out of 12 seats, LTTE got 7 and, therefore, it was, in effect, conceding Srilankan Tamilians' demands fully for a unity of their own within the unity and integrity of the country.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: If my distinguished friend would yield for a minute. because there is a substantial point that he is making....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): You will be speaking on it; your name is there.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: I do not interrupt anyone and I welcome interruptions. It means I am making very effective points.

So, these are the two basic things which were achieved by this accord or the agreement. And the third most important thing was the security aspect Those who know about Trincomales, those who know about the Voice of America or those who know about the military bases, would understand that we have taken care of the eastern border by cutting off Bangladesh and now we have taken care of the southern border by seeing that there is no presence of unfriendly forces in that region, particularly Trincomalee. I do not want to dilate more on this issue. But that was most important, because in years to come. there will be safe borders and it will be more than what we have spent today towards the security.

Now, what happened after the accord? The accord was accepted by one and all at that time as a courageous, as a sagacious agreement between Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi and President Jayewardene. I was in Geneva on that day and one should have heard the universal acclaim for the accord and for the two leaders at that time in all international forums. What happened was, the day the accord was signed, both Mr. Premadasa, the Prime Minister of Jayewardene Government. as well as Mr. Lalit Athulathmudali, did not attend the ceremony. The Naval Guard, while our Prime Minister was taking the Guard of Honour before boarding his plane, made a vain attempt on the life of our revered Prime Minister On 18th of August, 1987, hand-grenades were thrown into the room in Parliament where the Cabinet was meeting And even yesterday, we have read that bus has been exploded, killing 50 people and injuring over 100. This is one side of the story Sinhalese are not happy with the accord at all. They think that Mr. Jayewardene has sold them to India. On the other side, what happened to the LTTE? After everything was told to them, after everything had been agreed upon and even, as has been said from what was raised by the hon. Member here, referring to the paper. The Hindu, it is very clear that he knew what was happening, and what happened was that....

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE : You know Sri Lankan Communist Party is in full support.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: You will not take these interruptions in my time.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Please don't deal with that.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: What happened was that the LTTE started liquidating all rival forces there, whether it was PLOT or EROSE.... (*Interruption*). It is their admission that only the betrayers were finished. But as we perceived it, instead of surrendering arms, these people went on killing. It looked as if the Tamils would kill each other and finish themselves in the process.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias.* V. ARUNACHALAM: Instead, you do it.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: At this stage. I want any Member of the Opposition to point out a single newspaper which said that we should not intervene and disarm LTTE. Take Times of India; take Hindu; take Indian Express; take Statesman; take Hindustan Times.

Take any paper and you will find that repeatedly it has been said . (*Interruption*) Let me complete.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: We know the reason for it.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: Whatever it is; not one of them has expressed .. (*Interruption*)

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Mr. Gopalsamy, you had your say. Please allow him to complete.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: All right, Sir, I will not disturb him. You go on, Mr. Bhandare.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: I will just give a sample. One paper has said:

"SAVING THE ACCORD: A grave mistake was committed when the Government of India overlooked the failure of the LTTE and some other groups to surrender all the arms in their possession, presumably because Colombo too was tardy in fulfilling its part of the bargain. This mistake is now exacting a high price. As it happened, the extreme Indian solicitude for the LTTE bordering on appeasement only encouraged its leadership to become intransigent It is not as though the LTTE supremo, Mr. V. Prabhakaran, misread the signals from New Delhi. Rather, some wrong signals emanated from New Delhi leading him to believe that the Indian Government would not risk inviting the hostility of the Tamils of the Island, and possibly of India itself, by resorting to military action against his organisation Now that the circumstances have compelled India to commit its troops to disarm the militants, the task needs to be completed speedily...

I give emphasis here—

...whatever the cost, as this is the only way the Sri Lanka accord can be saved. Recognition of this fact is implicit in the significant augmentation of the strength of the Indian peace keeping force over the past week."

Sir, I am not quoting other newspapers here. I am only giving the substance of the matter. Not one of them has said that the IPKF should not disarm the militants This is not a war at all. This is an operation aimed only at disarming. It is a matter of shame, it is a matter of regret, it is a matter of tragedy that when our soldiers are fighting with one hand tied, they should be accused of genocide in the House

I will read out what they do (*Interruption*)

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: They have killed innocent civilians.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Mr Gopalsamy, you have given your word that you will not interrupt.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: When the Indian troops were under strict orders not to hurt ordinary people, the Tamil militants were callous and ruthless. They blew up a bus carrying Tamil citizens escorted by IPKF personnel killing mostly Tamils. In another incident, the militants set off a mine under a truck carrying IPKF personnel in Eastern Batticaloa killing 20 soldiers Five other Indian soldiers were burnt alive by placing blazing car tyres around their neck (*Interruptions*)

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Utter lie, utter falsehood. (*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Mr. Gopalsamy, you had your say for full one hour. Please do not interrupt him.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: I have given an eyewitness account about it.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN. This is also an eyewitness account.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: This is nothing but a Goebbelsian propaganda by this Government.

SHRI M. M. JACOB: I suggest that Mr. Bhandare should be asked to stand somewhere here and speak.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): That makes no difference.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: A wirless message which was intercepted said 'We are frying Indians' We have with our own eyes seen on the television the charred bodies of Indian soldiers. What do these militants do? They mix with the civilians. They do not wear uniforms at all.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: This is guerilla war. This is people's war. What happened in Vietnam?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Mr. Gopalsamy, this is not fair.

SHRI N. K P. SALVE (Maharashtra): If it is guerilla war, what is he complaining about the military action?

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: He is also conducting a guerilla war here.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: What they did was, they established a hold on all major buildings in Jaffna. The militants started using women and children as shields and fighting from behind Cowards ..(*Interruption*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Do not look to him You go on.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: They are valiant fighters. Even a small girl throws a grenade That shows how much they are involved in the fighting.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Mr. Gopalsamy I have told you twice. (*Interruptions*). Whatever Mr. Gopalsamy speaks, nothing will go on record.

SHRI M. M. JACOB: This is a running commentary which is not permitted as per rules.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: So, what I was trying to say is that the militants take help of all the buildings, all the civilian buildings, they fire from those civilian buildings and when there is a return fire they say that this is genocide, the civilians are being killed. My friend admitted that they have no uniform. He has said that even children are using granades. So, our soldiers had to do it under extremely provocative circumstances. All that I want to record on the floor of the House is that our soldiers have conducted themselves with exemplary restraint They have conducted themselves with great discipline I can tell you that the minute the skirmish was over, they have offered the best of medical help, they have offered the best of food. And here is no comparison between the Sinhalese Government and the Indian army. Therefore, let us not talk of the violation of the human rights at the hands of the IPKF. Let us salute our Indian soldiers who have laid their lives in fighting this war, and it is difficult to say that it is a war. I say, it is only an opration. (*Interruptions*). It is not a war at all. It is only an operation. It is an operation for peace, it is an operation for democracy, it is an operation for bringing democracy back on rails. People have said so many things about the accord. I want to express my perception. Mere accord does not bring democracy back on rails. It has to cover a long distance between militancy and democracy. Even elections, pursuant to accord, to do not necessarily restore democracy. Democracy like any other cherished thing is very difficult to acquire and preserve It is a process of time. Those who want to say that the accord has failed are sadly mistaken. Even today the solu-

[Shri Murlidhar Chandrakant Bhandare]

tion lies in preserving the accord. If accord fails, nothing remains and if accord survives, there is hope for democracy and the future for Tamilians themselves.

I do not say much. There is a lot said before, but there have been more interruptions than I would have desired What is most important is that we have kept all the options open for LTTE We have kept the option of amnesty. I have no doubt at all that the day they will surrender their arms, they will be given amnesty. And let them not make a mistake because if the Indian army meant it, they would not have taken so many days to capture Jaffna. They have taken so much time only because of their concern for the life of the civilians.

Therefore, I would only end by saying that we will continue with the relief measures, we will continue with our process of restoring democracy in Sri Lanka. We will show the sagacity, we will show the restraint, we will show the understanding that is necessary to solve the problem. We will see that we do not allow Sri Lankans to take undue advantage of this situation. Finally, I would only end up by saying that the price for peace always is very dear. In this case also it is proving costly and I still plead that better sense will prevail on the LTTE.

They will know better that their strength does not lie in the machine-gun or in the pistol or in any arm, but their strength really lies if they are in the hearts of the Tamilians in Sri Lanka. I may also add that if any body thinks that the Tamilians of Tamil Nadu are with the LTTE he is sadly mistaken. It is a war for politics; it is a petty war for politics between the political parties in Tamil Nadu.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V ARUNACHALAM: Never never

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: And somehow or other Mr. Karunanidhi is trying to get the maximum out of it.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: No, it is not for political ends. They are our kith and kin. You do not understand our feelings. And your Prime Minister will pay the price for this. Disastrous consequences will follow.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H HANUMANTHAPPA): Please sit down. you cannot go on like this.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: I am ending up. I am not going to be cowed down by the threats of the hon. Member, because I know what my country is and what my countrymen are. Let me assure this House that India will remain united despite what has been conveniently said as a matter of political gimmick by my friend here.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H HANUMANTHAPPA): Shri Sukomal Sen. Just one minute, please. I have to inform the hon. Members that the Prime Minister will make the statement at 5.15, as he is engaged there and he cannot come to this House. So the discussion will continue.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: We would like to be informed about the final time when the Prime Minister is likely to make the statement. You earlier announced that it was to be at 4 30 we would like to be given one time. We know the confusion in which the Government is This was earlier told to us as being at 4.30 Could you finally tell us the time when it will be made?

SHRI NIRMAL CHATERJEE: And you kindly ensure that the statement of the Prime Minister is circulated in time, which was not done yesterday.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: You could have told me earlier that the PM's statement

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN (West Bengal): Sir, this issue was discussed before the Prime Minister when he made the statement the other day.

Now about th Accord, I have nothing much to say, except that when the Accord was signed, our parties supported it and in Sri Lanka, when the Accord was signed, the entire Opposition and a section of the Government vehemently opposed it. I would like to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that it was only the Communist Party of Sri Lanka which extended support to it and none else in Sri Lanka. This was the situation when the Accord was signed.

Now some serious problems have developed. Every day we are getting news of killings on the Sri Lankan soil. Now, Sir, when we get the news of these killings, our heart is filled with deep sorrow. When a LTTE man is killed or an Indian soldier is killed. or when the LTTE mercilessly exterminates other militant groups, our hearts are filled with sorrow. When the LTTE massacres ordinary civilians or Sinhalese population, then also our hearts are filled with sorrow. So all types of killings are taking place in Sri Lanka. My point is, when IPKF went on disarming LTTE, whether it made a realistic assessment of the fire-power of LTTE, because previously we were told that within a week, everything will be finished; the task will be accomplished within a week or so. Now we see that the IPKF has been locked in a prolonged battle with the LTTE against their own interests.

[The Vice-Chairman (Shri Jagesh Desai) in the Chair]

Now I would like to know whether the Government of India was aware of the fire power of the LTTE. So many arms have been accumulated, so much ammunition has been accumulated Wherefrom have they come? I want to know whether all this information was not available to the Indian Government before taking on the LTTE.

Another point rising in my mind is, I would like to know facts from the Government because newspapers and periodicals of our country are giving vivid picture of the battle that is raging there, of the civilian casualties, of civilian population joining the LTTE militants All these things are coming out in Indian newspapers, not foreign newspapers. Now I would like to know from the Government about this and it should be stated very clearly—because the Indian people have a right to be informed since we are spending three to four crores of rupees every day on the battle that is going on in Sri Lanka and our jawans are laying down their lives there. So, the Indian people have every right to be properly informed as to what is happening in Sri Lanka, whether the IPKF is facing resistance only of a handful of LTTE militants. The other day the Prime Minister said that the number of the LTTE people could be counted. Then is it only a few hundred people of the LTTE pitted against the Indian Army there? Is the Indian Army, the IPKF, facing resistance from the common Tamil masses also? Because, newspapers are giving this news that even the common Tamil masses are taking up arms and fighting the Indian Army there. Is it a fact? If it is a fact, then it causes us deep worry. Then will they be locked up in a battle with the ordinary Tamil people of Jaffna in Sri Lanka, and where will it end? That is the main problem that is being faced by our Government and our people. The Government should state this very clearly.

Another point is, that day the Prime Minister said that the LTTE and other Tamil groups agreed to the formula of the accord. If that is so, it would have been more convincing if the Prime Minister had stated that they agreed Did they actually agree? Then, what was the dificulty in obtaining a written consent from them? Mr Prabhakaran was here in the hotel. What was the difficulty in obtaining a written consent from him that he agrees to the scheme of the accord? Now they say that they did not agree; now they oppose it. The Prime Minister says they agreed. They now say they agreed. They now say they never agreed

[Shri Sukomal Sen]

and now they are fighting. So it creates a very big confusion in our minds. Therefore, facts should be properly placed before us.

Now there is another point. There is another news now that the LTTE has sent a proposal, through their office in Madras, for a ceasefire. Is it a fact that the LTTE is actually serious about a ceasefire and whether today's news that through their Madras representative they have sent a proposal for a ceasefire is correct? The Government should state this clearly. There is yet another news that the LTTE has agreed to release 18 captive Indian soldiers who are now under the custody of the LTTE. Is this a fact? If all these are facts, then we will have to think anew about the situation because, if the LTTE is prepared to release the captive Indian soldiers, is prepared for a ceasefire and surrender of arms, then things would take a different shape. So, all these facts should be properly placed before the people so that we can be enlightened about the Sri Lankan situation.

So Sir, we are locked up in an unfortunate battle in Sri Lanka. Our Jawans are laying down their lives there. Every day the battle is taking place.

There is another point which is causing worry to us. The other day there was a big bomb blast in Colombo and they said that 50 were killed and hundreds were injured. We do not know whether there is any link now between the LTTE and the JVP because both are opposed to the accord. Whether there is any link between the two, that also should come before us and where-from—this question was raised earlier also—the LTTE is getting so much arms and ammunition What is the source? That should be found out by the Government. Otherwise, how can you fight this battle and how can you disarm them? Now they say that heaps of arms are being recovered. How is it possible? So, all these points are to be clarified by the Government and they should take steps to see that this problem is solved in a proper manner. You have this accord and unless the accord is implemented ultimately, it is not possible. Mr. Jayewardene says that he agrees to the devolution package. What is the devolution package and will the devolution package actually satisfy the Tamilian population? There is also news that even moderate groups like the TULF have expressed their doubts about the devolution package Actually whether the devolution package will satisfy the Tamil aspirations has to be properly sorted out. Otherwise the accord cannot be implemented properly and unless it is implemented, all this bloodshed, all this expenditure of money and lives will be in vain. I would like to have a proper statement from the Government Thank you.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA (Nominated): Respected Vice-Chairman, Sir, I have listened to the speech of my hon. colleague belonging to the DMK with considerable anguish and a little bit of confusion. I would like to remind the hon. Member that I had participated in the debate on Sri Lanka in March, 1987 when my hon. colleague had also participated. In the course of my speech I had said at that time, and I would quote:

> "The basic postulate of India's policy towards Sri Lanka is that there should be a united, stable non-aligned Sri Lanka free from all ethnic conflicts; free from all ethnic conflicts because there cannot be a peaceful, stable and non-aligned Sri Lanka unless the Tamilian people in Sri Lanka are guaranteed their basic human rights and full-fledged citizenship of Sri Lanka."

At the conclusion of my speech I had posed a question to the hon Minister, and the question was

> "Will India impress upon the Tamilian militants that a united Sri Lanka, a stable Sri Lanka and a non-aligned Sri Lanka is not only good for them but it is the national imperative of India because India's experience is that a disintegrated country becomes a hotbed of international intrigues, that

India cannot afford to have those intrigues in a disintegrated Sri Lanka on her southern fringe?".

The hon. colleague, it was a matter of pride for me, in the month of March, 1987 gave me a word of acclaim on what I stated on the floor of this hon. House.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Sir,

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Mr Gopalsamy, you had your full say.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: I am not contradicting him (*Interruptions*).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): You had your full say.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: I appreciated the way of presentation, not his view

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: If my hon friend says that he commended my manner of presentation, I make a solemn statement on the foor of his hon. House that the hon. colleague gave me a sense of pride when he asked me for a copy of my spech to be used in Tamil Nadu

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: What is there? On Sri Lanka I never accepted his view.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): That is all right. What provokes you, I don't understand.

SHRI MADAV BHATIA: Today I am shocked that the hon. Member has said on the foor of this hon. house: Who is India to stand in the way of the Eelam, in the way of disintegration of Sri Lanka? Sri Lanka has to be disintegrated That is the stand on the basis of which he has held the brief on behalf of those whose hands are soiled with the blood of the Indian soldiers

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: I hold the brief for the LTTE, yes, when this Government's hands are soiled with the blood of the Tamils (*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Order please. Please sit down

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Your hands are stained with the blood of Tamils.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH RESAI): Already you had your full say. Please sit down. Allow him to speak.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: I can only imagine that towards the conclusion of his speech his emotion got the better of his logic because when he opened up his speech he said "All right if India is not in favour of Eelam, there should be a homeland for the people of Tamil origin."

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: You go through my speech. You must agree with the demand of the Eelam. (*Interruptions*) Don't confuse.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): On every sentence, don't interrupt.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: The hon. colleague spoke about homeland and by that he meant that Eastern and Northern provinces to be joined together.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: You go through my speech. Don't get confused.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: So that the people of Tamil origin do rise to the full stature of their destiny, I would invite the attention of the hon. Member to the onening paragraph of this very Agreement. The Agreement says "Desiring to preserve the unity, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Sri Lanka: acknowledging that Sri Lanka is a multi-ethnic and a multi-lingual plural society consisting, *inter alia*, of Sinhalese, Tamils; Muslims and Burghers; recognising that each ethnic group has a distinct cultural and linguistic identity which has to be carefully nurtured; conscious of the necessity of strengthening the forces contributing to the unity, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Sri Lanka and pre-

[Shri Madan Bhatia]

serving its character as a multi-ethnic, multi-lingual and multi-religious plural society, in which all citizens can live in equality, safety and harmony, and prosper and fulfil their aspirations and also recognising that the Northern and the Eastern provinces have been areas of historical habitation of Sri Lankan Tamil speaking peoples, who have at all times hitherto lived together in this territory with other ethnic groups. Then, it goes on to proceed and say how the Eastern and Northern Provinces are to be unified. The hon. colleague says that this Agreement is a scrap of paper; it does not take into consideration the aspirations of the people of Tamil origin. In fact, even to our own people, we have not conceded the right to claim separate identity on the basis of culture or language or religion. It is for the first time that the Government of India under the leadership of the Prime Minister has secured to the people of Tamil origin their identity on the basis of their language, on the basis of their culture and on the basis of the particular areas which they have been inhabiting for the last thousands of years.

I respectfully submit, Sir, that this Agreement has been described as an historic Agreement I put it to myself what is historic about it? It is for the first time in the history of the world, in the history of international law that one sovereign nation has conceded the right to another sovereign nation to have a voice in the destiny of its own citizens. Now, name to me a single agreement or a single treaty where such right was conceded by one sovereign nation over its own citizens to another sovereign nation. It is for the first time in the history of the world, not connected with war or defeat, that one friendly, sovereign nation has conceded the right to another soverign nation to say that what happens on its soil may have repercussion on its security and should not be allowed to take place. This is the historic nature of this agreement. It is not an agreement. It is a solemn treaty. It is a solemn treaty under the international law. And what is the sanctity of a treaty between two sovereign nation? I quote in this regard a famous observation by the International Court of Justice when it said, "The treaty proper is a formal document of traditional character. It consists of Preamble, body and final clauses and it has the force of law." Some hon. Members when the hon. Prime Minister made a statement in this House the other day spoke in derogatory terms about the acclaim which this treaty or accord had received from the Commonwealth countries, from the United States, from the Soviet Union and from the nations at large. It is not a matter of acclaim for the individual Prime Minister. It has far-reaching consequences under the international law. A treaty which receives general acceptation from the nations at large acquires the force of international law and this treaty, which has given the right to India to have a say in the destiny of Tamil people and which has given the right to her to have a say in the security environment and the security developments in Sri Lanka has now the force of law and has acquired the characteristics of international law. Those who say today that this treaty is a scrap of paper and should not be honoured, do they realise what they are talking about? At one go, they are asking India to throw away those rights which India has secured, which no sover nation, over the history of the world has ever secured. No treaty has ever given such rights to a sovereign nation. No sovereign nation has ever acquired such rights over the citizens of another country, over the soil of another country as this treaty has given those rights to India. I respectfully submit, Sir, that let us imagine what would have been the scenario if this treaty, this agreement had not come about. It was beyond the military strength of Sri Lanka to deal with the military force of the LTTE. If Sri Lanka wanted to save the integrity of her own country, Sri Lanka had to depend on the external military force. Supposing, India had refused to give this aid, supposing India had refused to provide this guarantee to the integrity of Sri Lanka; Is there any provision under the international law by which India could stop Sri Lanka

from seeking the assistance of Pakistani forces to come into Sri Lanka? Was there any provision under the International Law which would prevent Sri Lanka from seeking the assistance of force, hostile to India to deal with LTTE? What would have then happened? It would have not only created an extremely explosive situation for India but for those who are civilians of Tamils origin. The forces of Pakistan would not have shown that regard that our forces show Our soldiers get themselves killed so that the civilians may live. There would have been a massacre of the civilian population in Sri Lanka at the hands of Pakistani forces. Do you realise this? It is the Indian army which is disciplined and which has inner feeling for the people of Tamil origin. The soldiers laid down their lives so that the people belonging to the civilian population were not hurt It is impossible in a conflagration of this type that some stray incidents should not take place But the fact stands that in his whole conflagration, it is the Indian army which has been consistent with her glorious traditions and fought with the LTTE and has taken as much precaution as has been possible to see that no harm is done to the civilian population. My hon. colleagues here are pleading for the civilian population. The civilian population, but for this agreement, but for the intervention of the Indian army, would have become the victim of those forces who would have shown scant regard for the blood of the Tamil population. Do you realise this?

We have got those right, under this Agreement and now we are being told that India should carry out the cease fire. Do you realise the implications of this demand? The only obligation which the Treaty has imposed upon India in return for its rights is that India shall secure the surrender of arms by the militants. This is the only obligation I will read just a few clauses of this Agreement (*Interruptions*)

> "All arms presently held by militant groups will be surrendered in accordance with an agreed procedure to authorities to be designated by the Government of Sri Lanka."

Then it says,

> "The Government of India will underwrite and guarantee the resolution and cooperation in the implementation of these proposals."

Then it says,

> "These proposals are also conditional upon the Government of India taking the following action:
>
> If any militant groups operating in Sri Lanka do not accept the framework of proposals for a settlement namely,
>
> (C) In the event that the Government of Sri Lanka requests the Government of India to afford military assistance to implement these proposals, the Government of India will cooperate by giving to the Government of Sri Lanka such military assistance as and when requested"

This is the solemn obligation imposed upon the Government of India under this Treaty, from which India has got these fundamental, basic rights, unprecedented rights to discharge this obligation. What will be the consequences if India shirks from the discharge of this obligation? Under the international law Sri Lanka will have every right to repudiate this agreement and make it a nullity. In this regard I will just quote one or two authorities. One: O'Connel, a famous authority on international law He says—

> "A party is entitled to cancel a treaty on the ground of non-performance of its co-contractor provided it acts with reasonable promptness so as not to excuse the non-performance and provided the non-performance is material."

This is the only performance which India is required to do—securing the surrender of arms by the militants. And then, Article 60 of the Vienna Convention says—

> "A national breach of a bilateral treaty by one of the parties entitles the other to invoke the breach as a ground for terminating the treaty."

[Shri Madan Bhatia]

If you make a demand, I warn the honourable Members on this side, if you make a demand that there should be a ceasefire announced by the IPKF or by the Government of India without securing the surrender of arms from the militants, you are, in effect, asking the Government of India to violate its solemn obligations under the treaty. You are giving a handle to Sri Lanka to destroy and nullify this agreement and destroy all the international rights which you have secured after a protracted, long, negotiation of three or four years This will be the consequence. Ponder over it.

As regards the security aspect of it, this is particularly very important. I would remind the honourable Members of this House that in 1950 when the King of Nepal took refuge in the Indian Embassy, and at that time the Prime Minister of Nepal who at that time used to be everything over there; started hobnobbing with the idea of inviting the external forces in order to deal with the situation. At that time Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru said—

> "We are not going to tolerate any person coming over this barrier. Therefore, much as we appreciate the independence of Nepal, we cannot risk our own security by anything going wrong in Nepal which permits either that barrier to be crossed or otherwise weakness our frontier. India did not like and did not propose to like any foreign interference."

This was the situation before this treaty was entered into. Today this principle which was announced by, proclaimed by, Pandit Nehru based on the international principle of self-defence, has been given recognition by Sri Lanka herself in the form of this treaty. And that is, the gain of India. My heart goes out to the soldiers who are fighting in Sri Lanka My heart goes out to those soldiers who have lost their lives; Their children have become orphans; Their wives have become widows. But I am proud of them A nation which does not know how to die for its own security has no right to live and India has a right to live and India will fight for the security just as much as India has been fighting for the rights of the Tamilian people and India will not and cannot tolerate the disintegration of Sri Lanka, because that will turn Sri Lanka into a hot-bed of international imperialistic intrigues which India cannot afford to have on her southern fringe.

5 00 P.M.

DR. G. VIJAYA MOHAN REDDY (Andhra Pradesh). Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I rise to speak in all moderation which the situation demands. The Indian army is in strength in Sri Lanka. At the outset itself Sir, I want to assure that the Telugu Desam Party is second to none in praising the glorious role played by our army in defending our borders, in protecting the sovereignty and integrity of our country, and I bow my head in homage for the great sacrifices made by the Indian army.

Coming to the Indo-Sri Lankan accord, however much I may rack my brain using all the logic at my command, I am not in a position to arrive at the optimistic conclusion which the Treasury Benches have come to. The Prime Minister has, in his *suo motu* statement, said that with the full implementation of the accord, the Tamil aspirations would be met, the unity and integrity of Sri Lanka preserved and peace and stability of the region restored, and some of the important security concerns would be met. But the Prime Minister has, unfortunately, not stated anything about the full peaceful implementation of the accord. If he had stated that as a peaceful and non-aligned country, using the word "Panchsheel", one of the principles of which is peaceful co-existence between the States, we could have appreciated. But it is easier said than done.

We have the foretaste of so many accords which the Prime Minister has signed and with what results. The Members of this august House are aquainted with these accords However, these are our internal matters, internal matters of our country. But this accord is a matter concerning the sovereignty of another county. Anyone with common sense,

who has lived in India and gone through the turmoils which our country had to pass through before attaining Independence and after attaining Independence, will not appreciate the cavalier attitude towards the settlement of a difficult problem.

Anybody who knows Sri Lanka could very well understand that the ethnic problem has developed under some historical conditions and would have to be resolved in that country itself by the various forces that have emerged there. President Jayewardene is the main party to the agreement. We have to analyse his role in Sri Lanka politics. Was he for the preservation of democratic rights of the minority Tamils there or was he for fomenting ethnic conflicts between the Tamils and the Sinhalese and making political capital out of this inhuman game? It is seen that Mr. Jayewardene was always manipulative and stormed to power from a virulent anti-Tamil platform succeeding Shrimati Sirimavo Bandaranaike Within a month of assuming power on 22nd July 1977, anti-Tamil riots broke out in Sri Lanka with hundreds of Tamils killed and with over a lakh of homeless refugees. With this wave behind him, in July 1978 a new Constitution in Sri Lanka was enacted and under the new Constitution, Prime Minister Jayewardene became President Jayewardene with dictatorial powers From then on we are hearing of genocide using of armed forces on civil population The democratic movements of the Tamil minorities to win their demands of better livelihood, education, employment, protection of their language and culture and business through peaceful means were all suppressed. This situation created the necessity for the emergence of armed groups of Tamils engaging in actions of self-defence with arms in hands, which gathered strength in the past ten years shedding their blood. This is their story written in blood and tears. Armed groups emerged and they became stronger everyday. From 1983 onwards, our Government has been involved in the negotiations. From the beginning our position was to assist the Sri Lankan Government and the Tamil groups to come to a peaceful solution in the interest of all. Because of the refugee problem and the proximity and close historical relation, between both the countries and the blood ties of the Tamils in Sri Lanka and the Tamils in Tamil Nadu, our interests were well appreciated by one and all. At the negotiating table, Mr. Jayewardene was taking an optimistic stand all through using negotiations as a ruse. This has been told several times in this august House itself. From the beginning he believed in a military solution of the problem and he has stated pit openly several times. He sought the help from forces who are akin to his ideology, that is, Israelis, Pakistanis and South Africans. In spite of these efforts, he was not able to break the armed resistance and his economy began to give way because of continued strife and unsecured conditions.

The Indian public opinion was roused at the callous killings, genocide perpetrated on their brothers, and the tale of woe and suffering. The Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu, Honourable M.G. Ramachandran declared an assistance of Rs 4 crores to be given in the form of food, medicines, clothing, to the stranded Tamils. Jayewardene was forced to change his tactics. When we airdropped food and medicines, he knew his days were numbered because nobody was supporting his position at home and abroad. Even the Sinhalese segment of the population was simmering with discontent and J.V.P. began raising its head once more

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Please conclude.

DR. G. VIJAYA MOHAN REDDY: With this background, Jayewardene came forward for an agreement with India, and not the minority Tamils of his own country with whom he was at war and at the same time negotiating for such a long period. Herein lies the entire complexity of the situation.

All the while the Rajiv Gandhi Government was only assisting in the negotiations between Sri Lanka Government and Tamil groups but suddenly the positions were changed. There was a right about turn. Whom did the Government consult

[Dr G Vijaya Mohan Reddy]

before taking this stand? Has the matter at least been discussed in the Indian Cabinet? We have got a right to know.

The Tamil groups state that they were asked to agree to an agreement which had already been there. Some of the groups stated that the agreement has been forced on them. What is the bilateral issue involved between Sri Lanka Government and the Government of India? Even if such an issue was there, it should have been settled peacefully. Is it because that powers that be wanted to make a political capital out of the issue? That is my question. After 3/1-2 months of the agreement where do we stand? I don't want to enter into details. As it stands today, who are supporting this accord? In Sri Lanka, all the Tamil groups, moderates, militants the LTTE are against it The Sinhalese are against it. Prime Minister Premadasa and a big majority of his Cabinet are opposed to it. When everybody is opposing the accord, what is the stand of Mr. Jayewardene? He says that the IPKF has come on his invitation. Their job is to disarm the Tamil militants even if it means continuous conflict with loss of life and suffering.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): It is already ten mintes. Please sit down.

DR. G. VIJAYA MOHAN REDDY: Today's conflict may develop into hit-and-run engagements popularly known as guerilla war. As for Mr. Jayewardene, he was never sympathetic to Tamils of their legal rights. For the Indian Government, Thilillpan's death on 26-9-87 after 12 days' fast could have been the warning.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Eleven minutes are already over

DR G VIJAYA MOHAN REDDY: In whose interest are we fighting with mounting casualties each day? Why went into save the Tamils but today we think that Tamil Tigers are our enemies and should be crushed They are part of the Tamil people. They have emerged from them and they are fighting for their survival. Even if we kill all the Tamil militants and leave Sri Lanka, whom are we handing over the Tamil minority, except to the racist regime in Sri Lanka? Because of these factors, we the Telugu Desam Party criticised the Government for the undue haste with which we entered the agreement Because of if we told the real agreement could be only between Sri Lanka Government and the Tamil minorities to achieve for which we had laboured for the past five years. We warned you of these developments and were not led by the euphoria of the ..*(Time Bell rings)* Even now it is not late for the Government of India to re-assess the situation and immediately announce a unilateral cease-fire and take charge of the situation and try for political solution of the ethnic problem of Sri Lanka with justice to all parties

It is stated by the Anna DMK that MGR also wants an immediate ceasefire. And another thing is .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Now please be seated.

DR. G. VIJAYA MOHAN REDDY.. let us not bring in the example of Bangladesh .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Nothing will go on record.

DR. G. VIJAYA MOHAN REDDY:**

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Mr. Narayanasamy, please.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, thank you for giving me an opportunity to speak on the Indo-Sri Lankan Agreement and the situation prevailing in Sri Lanka.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, for the past 40 years, after the Sri Lankan independence, gradually we found that the Tamils have been treated as second class citizens by the Sri Lankan dynasty. And in the year 1983, when the Tamils were being

**Not recorded

massacred by the Sri Lankan Government and the Army, our hon. Prime Minister, Mrs Indira Gandhi, gave a call to the Sri Lankan administration that India will not keep quiet if the Tamils are being killed in an adjoining region.

Sir, our hon. Prime Minister, immediately after taking the reins found that there should be peace and tranquility in the adjoining region for the purpose of development of the entire Asian region. Sir, as persons coming from the South, we have also expressed our anguish that the Tamils should not be massacred by the Sri Lankan Army for no fault of the civilian population. Then negotiations were held and all the Tamil Eelam groups and the revolutionary groups of Tamil population have been taken into confidence and the historic agreement was signed on 29th July, 1987. The important feature of the Accord which was signed by our hon. Prime Minister and President Jayewardene was that such kind of an accord was never signed in the 20th century. Sir, I would like to give a few details of the Accord in brief. Firstly, no sovereign country will permit the Army, the Air Force and the Navy of another country to enter into its own territory There is a provision in this Accord to that effect for the purpose of safeguarding not only the Tamils but also to maintain the sovereignty and the integrity of Sri Lanka. Secondly, Sir, our electoral officers have been permitted to go to Sri Lanka for the purpose of peaceful elections there either to keep the Eastern region separately or to join the Northern and Eastern regions together. Thirdly, Sir, America's influence in Sri Lanka was curtailed by this Accord. Fourthly, the Forces of Pakistan, Israel and Britain had been kept out of the scene. Sir, is that not a historic agreement? My hon. friend from the Opposition, my learned friend Mr. Gopalsamy says that this Agreement is killing Tamils. Sir, I would like to say that he is also supporting a separate Tamil Eelam. Sir, now I would like to narrate the history of DMK. Their demand earlier was a separate Tamil Nadu What happened later?

..(**Mr. Chairman** in the Chair]

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY. Not separate Tamil Nadu, Dravida Nadu.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: I will come to that, You kindly hear me. Sir, abruptly they have given up their stand for a separate Tamil Nadu which they had raised as Dravida Nadu. Then they have given up their stand

SHRI T R. BALU: You are not correct. First understand the history of that.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Kindly wait. Then, Sir, a TFLO leader, Mr Sabaratnam was killed. He was also a Tamil leader. The DMK leader said that he is not interfering in the affairs of this Tamil group till all of them joined together. Now, all of them are joining together. Kindly see. Except the LTTE, other groups are together. And they are supporting the Accord. Why have the LTTE have gone back against the terms of the agreement which they have agreed to with the Government of India and Sri Lankan Government was because there are certain forces which are working in Tamil Nadu and they are trying to sabotage this agreement which is being well-framed and well-settled for the purpose of peace and tranquility in that region of Sri Lanka.

Sir, I would like to refer to another aspect. They are crying for the Tamil. These are the people who identified KUTTI MANI and later handed over him to the Sri Lankan army (*Interruptions*).

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: It is false It is a malicious propaganda. It is totally faulse (*Interruptions*).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let him continue, otherwise there will be no end.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Another aspect I would like to say is that the LTTE was just fighting with our Indian Peace Keeping Forces. Their own leader wanted a letter from the LTTE persons that if they want a separate....

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Totally false, he is misleading the House Utter falsehood. It is Goebbel's propaganda. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: I am not yielding. When he was speaking I did not interrupt.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are not having a shouting match Let us hear him and let everybody have his say. The House has permitted everybody to say what he wants to say. Others also will get their turn and they will say what they want to say.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Sir, he spoke for one full hour and now he is interrupting. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the leaders that they are representing, the regional parties in Tamil Nadu, we found that they are playing a political game and they are not interested in saving the lives of Tamils in Sri Lanka. This is patently clear from their activity. Apart from that, my friend has accused that the Indian Government has not taken the LTTE into confidence I refute the allegations made by him. He is not aware of the facts that the LTTE leaders have been briefed about the terms of the accord.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Narayanasamy, you may kindly resume your seat. You will resume your speech afterwards.

STATEMENT BY PRIME MINISTER ON HIS VISITS ABROAD SINCE THE LAST SESSION OF PARLIMENT

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI RAJIV GANDHI): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to apprise the House of my visits abroad since the last session of Parliament.

On my way to the Commonwealth Summit in Canada, I made a brief halt in Tokyo on the 12th October for an exchange of views with Prime Minister, Nakasone. The Prime Minister expressed Japan's full support to the Indo-Sri Lankan Agreement. We discussed matters of mutual interest. A soft united Japanese credit equivalent to $ 200 million was announced.

The Commonwealth Summit was held in Vancouver from the 13th to the 17th October.

The Summit took place amidst growing speculation that the Commonwealth had run out of steam in its campaign against the apartheid in South Africa. This was proved wrong. All the Commonwealth countries, with the exception of Britain, agreed that sanctions were beginning to have the desired effect We, therefor, decided to intensify the pressure and expand the scope of sanctions. We undertook to work for wider international acceptance and better implementation of the Commonwealth sanctions programme.

Several new suggestions, including those made by us, were accepted. We agreed to undertake, on a continuing basis, an evaluation of the impact of sanctions. We also agreed that any effort to frustrate these sanctions should be identified and brought to light. We concurred on the need for an expert study to examine the implications of Pretoria's relationship with the international financial system for the maintenance of the apartheid regime. We will take further action, including additional sanctions, in response to the situation as it evolves. The Programme of Action relating to sanctions on South Africa was adopted by all Commonwealth countries, with the solitary exception of Britain

All of us initiated a programme of coordinated Commonwealth assistance to the Frontline States. A Special Fund was established to provide technical assistance to Mozambique Commonwealth assistance to the victims and opponents of apartheid will be expanded. We agreed to give high priority to efforts aimed at removing censorship in South Africa, because it is such censorship which hides the truth about South Africa from world public opinion. To provide high level impetus and guidance for achieving these objectives, the Summit set up an eight member Committee of Foreign Ministers. The Committee will be chaired by Canada and includes India.